

REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Official Action mailed on May 6, 2005. Applicants have currently amended claims 11-22 and have cancelled claims 23 and 24. Thus, claims 11-22, as amended, are now pending and presented for reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Claims 11-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,292,618 to Ohara et al. ("Ohara") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,624 to Saib et al. ("Saib"). With the amended claims, Applicants maintain that the combination of Ohara and Saib do not render obvious the present invention.

Neither Ohara nor Saib relate to the provision of a received or reproduced program explanation screen or a received or reproduced contents display screen as now called for in the present claims. Namely, such program explanation and received contents display screens include information about the currently selected program or the program being reproduced by the external storage device.

Furthermore, neither Ohara nor Saib relate to the display of substantially similar program related display screens, one display screen being for the currently selected program being viewed and the other display screen being for the program currently being reproduced by the external storage device. Such different display screens are shown, for example, in the present application at Figure 2, which shows the received program explanation screen and received contents display screen for the currently selected program, and Figure 5, which shows the different reproduced program explanation screen and reproduced contents display screen for the program being currently reproduced by the external storage device.

Saib, however, is relied upon the Examiner to show the superposition of an onscreen display on a television program.

But Saib only displays an electronic program guide (EPG) over a video or still image and does not superimpose program explanation screens or contents display screens about the currently selected or reproduced program over the currently selected or reproduced program. Thus, Saib fails to remedy the deficiencies in Ohara with respect to the lack of superimposition of the screens about the television programs actually being viewed on the television program being viewed.

Finally, neither Ohara nor Saib, alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest the features of independent claim 21 wherein there is provided a first set and second set of user selection indicia elements. The second set of indicia elements provided to the at least one of the reproduced program explanation screen and reproduced contents display screen includes some, but not all, of the indicia elements of the first set of indicia elements so as to omit one or more indicia elements of the first set that are no longer valid user selections when viewing the television program being reproduced by the external storage device. This prevents user confusion.


Accordingly, for all of the above reasons, Applicants submit that the present claims are not rendered obvious by Ohara in view of Saib and Applicants therefore respectfully request that a notice of allowance be issued with respect to the pending claims.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections that he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: September 23, 2005

Respectfully submitted

By 

Jonathan A. David

Registration No.: 36,494

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicants

596858_1.DOC